

REMARKS

Claims 1, 5, 8, 11 and 12 have been amended, and new claims 14 and 15 have been added. Therefore, claims 1-15 are pending.

Submitted herewith is a certified priority document of corresponding Japanese Patent Application No. 2000-117440 for the purpose of claiming foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. An indication that this document has been safely received would be appreciated.

The claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the article "One-Stop ASP Service for Small and Midsize Businesses Could Be the End of Packaged Small Business Software" (PR Newswire; New York; April 17, 2000), hereinafter One-Stop ASP Service, in view of official notice regarding e-commerce. Reconsideration of the rejection is requested for the following reasons.

According to the present invention, the user is provided with services of applications selected from application candidates that satisfy function requirements selected from a business function list of holding applications and charge requirements specified by the user. In this manner, the

application services that the user requires are efficiently provided. See Figure 4, for example, which shows the charge requirements 422 that are entered by a user, as shown in Figure 8 (455). See page 17, lines 18 to page 19, line 17 of the Specification.

In the cited One-Stop ASP Service reference, the operation platforms of Internet business services (IBSs) for small and midsize companies are disclosed as being provided to a user through a StageBuilder platform. The user selects the available businesses from a menu on a website and performs data exchange. However, the One-Stop ASP Service reference does not disclose or suggest providing services in consideration of function requirements input by a user selected from a business function list and including charge requirements specified by the user. Accordingly, the reference does not render obvious the invention as claimed by applicants in amended claims 1-13.

Further, new claim 14 is patentable at least for being dependent from a patentable base claim and for specifying specific examples of charge requirements. New independent claim and new independent claim 15 also sets forth a

combination that is patentable over the references of record by including that the user sets forth predetermined function requirements, response requirements and charge requirements of an application service so that an application satisfying these requirements is selected and proposed as the selected application to the user. Accordingly, the pending claims should be found to be allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



John R. Mattingly  
Registration No. 30,293  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

MATTINGLY, STANGER & MALUR  
1800 Diagonal Road, Suite 370  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
(703) 684-1120  
Date: October 16, 2003